

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present Amendment E, claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 10 are pending in the application, of which claims 1, 6, and 10 are independent.

The applicant gratefully acknowledges indication by the Examiner that claims 1, 2, and 7 are allowed, and 6 and 10, although objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, include allowable subject matter.

In the above amendments, all claims which the Examiner has not indicated contain allowable subject matter have been canceled. Still further, claims 6 and 10, which the Examiner has indicated do contain allowable subject matter, have been rewritten in independent form.

Interview With the Examiner

The applicant thanks the Examiner for his helpful and courteous remarks during telephone discussions with one of applicant's representatives held on August 10, 2006 and August 25, 2006. During the most recent interview, the Examiner again indicated that if claims 6 and 10 were rewritten in independent form and if the rest of the non-allowed claims were canceled, that the application would be in condition for allowance.

Response to Office Action

The above-identified Office Action has been reviewed, the references carefully considered, and the Examiner's comments carefully weighed. In view thereof, the present Amendment E is submitted. The applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the claims are fully supported by the original disclosure, including the original claims and drawings. Applicant also respectfully submits that no new matter has been added to the application in these amendments, and further that no new issues are raised by the above amendments because they only involve deletion of non-allowed subject matter and

rewriting two claims in independent form. It is contended that by the present amendments, all bases of rejection set forth in the Office Action have been traversed and overcome. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the final rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection 35 USC 112, Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 5, 9, 13 and 14 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 3, recitation “the buckle is adapted to be fixed to a rear end face of the accommodator....a face which faces the rear of the vehicle” renders the claim indefinite for being unclear, since according to the specification and the drawing, the buckle 10 is fixed to the side end face of the accommodator 21 but not to the rear end face of the accommodator 21 as claimed. With respect to claims 5, 9, 13 and 14, these claims are also indefinite for being unclear with similar reasons as indicated above, in the case, the anchor 4 is fixed to the side end face of the accommodator/seat supporting member 21 but not to the rear end face of the accommodator/seat supporting member 21 as claimed.

Applicant's Response

In the application as currently amended, the rejected claims 3, 5, 9, 13 and 14 have been canceled. In view of such claim cancellations, it is believed that the rejection is overcome and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejection – 35 USC 102

At item 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 3, 5, 9, 11 and 13-14 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Aoki (US 6,069,325) for reasons substantially the same as presented in the previous Office Action. However, as stated in the

“Response to Arguments” at item 5 of the Office Action, although the Examiner agrees with applicant’s arguments that Aoki does not disclose either the seat belt buckle or the anchor being fixed to the rear end face of the accommodator, wherein the rear end face corresponds to a face facing towards the rear of the vehicle, the Examiner continues to reject these claims as allegedly anticipated by the Aoki reference because the Examiner did not consider that the original disclosure supported such claimed structure, as discussed above in relation to the 112 rejection.

Applicant’s Response

As mentioned above, in the application as currently amended, the rejected claims 3, 5, 9, 11, 13 and 14 have been canceled. In view of such claim cancellations, it is believed that the rejection is overcome and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Again applicant gratefully acknowledges that the Examiner has allowed claims 1, 2, 7, and that the Examiner has objected to claims 6 and 10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Based on all of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that since all claims which the Examiner has indicated do not contain allowable subject matter have been canceled, all of the objections and rejections set forth in the final Office Action are overcome, and that as presently amended, all of the pending claims are believed to be allowable over all of the references of record, whether considered singly or in combination.

The applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of record, and allowance of the pending claims.

If the Examiner is not fully convinced of the allowability all of the claims now in the application, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephonically contact applicant's undersigned representative to expeditiously resolve prosecution of the application.

Entry of the present Amendment E is respectfully requested under 37 CFR 1.116 on the grounds that: the Amendment does not raise any new issues for consideration by the Examiner because it only deletes claims which the Examiner has indicated do not contain allowable subject matter; the Amendment reduces the number of issues on appeal, if necessary, by making the claims more definite; and moreover, the Amendment is believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Customer No. 21828
Carrier, Blackman & Associates, P.C.
24101 Novi Road, Suite 100
Novi, Michigan 48375
September 5, 2006

Joseph P. Carrier
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 31,748
(248) 344-4422

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on September 5, 2006.



JPC/amc